DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 616 UD 023 312

AUTHOR Tompkins, John F.
TITLE Report of Evaluation, Title I Mathematics Program, 1981-82.
INSTITUTION Des Moines Public Schools, IA. Dept. of Evaluation and Research.
PUB DATE 5 Nov 82
NOTE 36p.; Light print; Published by the Department of Evaluation and Research; For related documents, see UD 023 309-313.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Gains; Attendance; Attitude Change; *Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; Junior High Schools; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics
IDENTIFIERS *Des Moines Public Schools IA

ABSTRACT

In the 1981-82 school year, the Des Moines Title I math program served 1261 students in grades 1-8. The students mastered over 80 percent of the program objectives and achieved an increase in percentile rank from fall to spring. According to the results of attitude measurements, junior high school students' attitudes toward learning became more positive over the school year. Personal contacts between Title I teachers and parents of the students they serve occurred with the frequency necessary to achieve all objectives except one. Attendance records indicated that secondary Title I students attended 88.9 percent of the days possible while non-Title I students at the same buildings attended 91.0 percent. The process of setting goals for students to work toward in the secondary program was reported as being a "motivator as well as a positive self-concept enhancer for students and teachers." (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241616

REPORT OF EVALUATION

Title I Mathematics Program

1981-82

Department of Evaluation and Research
Des Moines Independent Community School District
1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50307

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Morris D. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

John F. Tompkins
Title I Program Evaluator

Approved by: Morris D. Wilson

Morris D. Wilson, Ph.D.
Director of Evaluation and Research

November 5, 1982

UD023312

DES MOINES INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH
EVALUATION ABSTRACT

November 5, 1982

PROJECT TITLE:	Title I Mathematics Program
COORDINATORS:	Kathleen Bullington, Elementary Coordinator Wanda Everage, Secondary Coordinator
STAFF:	1.38 - Coordinators 33.00 - Resource Teachers 1.50 - Secretary
OPERATIONAL SITES:	Elementary Schools: All Saints, Brooks, Findley, Garton, Howe, Edmunds-Jefferson, King-Perkins, Longfellow, Lucas, Madison, McKinley, Mitchell, Moulton, Oak Park, Phillips, Monroe-Rice, St. Anthony, Wallace, Willard, Holy Family #1, Holy Family #2, Holy Family #3 Junior High Schools: Callanan, Harding, Hiatt and Weeks
POPULATION SERVED: (as of Sept., 1981)	Public School Students (1-6): 982 Public School Students (7-8): 171 Nonpublic School Students (1-6): 95 Nonpublic School Students (7-8): 13 Total Students (1-8): 1261
FUNDING:	Source: Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amount Budgeted: $873,707.48 Amount Expended: 360,817.90 Cost Per Pupil: 682.65

COMMENTS:

Title I Mathematics students mastered in excess of 80 percent of the objectives presented to them.

According to results of the Self-Anchoring Attitude Toward Learning Scale, students in Grades 7 and 8 displayed a more positive attitude toward learning near the close of the school year than in the fall.

Personal contacts between Title I teachers and parents of students they serve occurred with the frequency necessary to achieve all objectives with the exception of the one dealing with secondary program students during the first semester.

Attendance records indicated that secondary Title I students attended school 88.9 percent of the days possible while non Title I students at the same buildings attended 91.0 percent. At one building, the same rate of attendance was exhibited.

The process of setting goals for students to work toward in the secondary program was reported as being a "motivator as well as a positive self-concept enhancer for students and teachers."

Students at all grade levels achieved an increase in percentile rank from fall to spring testing in total math on the appropriate level of the ITBS.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Program administration should continue implementation of strategies to encourage improved school attendance of Title I students at the secondary level.

2. The process of student goal setting appears to be a positive strategy in the secondary program and should be continued.

3. The secondary program should continue to work toward increasing the number of parent contacts so criterion levels may be met.

4. As 1981-82 was the first year that the ITBS was used in this program as a student performance evaluation instrument, it is recommended that program staff utilize the test data as a baseline for setting performance criterion levels for 1982-83. In doing so, the program staff may wish to consider establishing gain criteria specific to each grade level rather than having a single gain criteria apply to all grades.

A copy of the complete Evaluation Report is available upon request from the Department of Evaluation and Research, 1800 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, IA 50307.

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 provides financial assistance to local education agencies for programs to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children. Children are eligible for the program if they come from areas with high concentrations of low income families and their academic performance is below acceptable levels.

The Des Moines district, utilizing Title I funds, initiated a supplementary reading program during the 1965-66 school year and a supplementary mathematics program during the 1972-73 school year. The impetus for the programs was that there were a significant number of students performing below desired levels on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

In February, 1981, the National Dissemination Review Board awarded exemplary status to the Des Moines Title I Mathematics program (Grades 2-6). This status indicates the program was effective in providing compensatory mathematics services and could be used as a model for other school districts to develop similar programs.

During the 1981-82 school year, the district employed a fulltime equivalent staff of 33 teachers and 1.38 coordinators to provide Title I mathematics services for Grades 1-8. The program was located in 20 public elementary schools, 4 junior high schools and 5 nonpublic schools. Grades served in individual buildings varied according to available space and the organization of the school.

Student Selection

Students were selected under a two phase process. First, students were identified according to their performance on the district's objective based mathematics tests. Students with the lowest scores were selected

first until the scores reached a predetermined criteria or the space allocation for the teacher was filled. Secondly, the classroom teacher may have recommended that a student needed additional help. If the student scored above the criteria used for the initial screening, the Title I Entry Skills Test (TEST) was administered to determine the student's achievement level. This test was also used to determine which students scoring at or near the criteria used in the first phase of screening were in greatest need.

Title I regulations stipulate conditions under which students could not be served. These conditions for not selecting students are listed in the Needs Assessment Checklist. Additionally, priorities were established by grade level. Students in the elementary program were selected according to the following order: 2-3-4-1-5-6. In the secondary program the grade order was 7-8.

Major Methods and Activities in the Instructional Program

The basic philosophy underlying the project was that Title I students are capable of learning. The Title I staff was responsible for assessing each student's weaknesses and providing remedial instruction in those areas. Weaknesses (and strengths) were identified from the district's mathematics objective based tests, which are based on the district's mathematics objectives for Grades K-8. Each student had an educational plan that was used to guide the students instruction and to provide a continuous record of concepts introduced and mastered by the student. The educational plan stays with the student throughout his or her involvement in the Title I Mathematics programs.

The primary method of instruction used manipulative devices (blocks, beads, coins, etc.) to develop concepts. As the students recorded the

results of their experiments with the manipulatives, they discovered arithmetical algorithms. Games and other activities were used to reinforce the learned concepts.

Organization for Instruction

Title I Mathematics teachers worked daily with the identified Title I students for approximately one-half of the student's regularly scheduled mathematics class. The actual amount of time the Title I teachers instructed each group ranged from 20 minutes to approximately 45 minutes, depending upon grade level and building. A minimum of 100 minutes of instruction per week was required. In some cases, Title I teachers met with students for the entire math period on an alternating day basis. In schools where scheduling permitted, small group instruction was carried out by the Title I teachers in the learner's classroom, however, in most schools children were served outside the classroom. The maximum number of students served by a fulltime teacher was 40. Sizes of groups ranged from 1 to 6 at the elementary level and from 1 to 11 at the secondary level. The average group size at the secondary level was approximately 6.

Parent Contact and Participation

Parents were involved in the program through participation in parent advisory council activities. During the 1981-82 school year, a district council as well as building councils provided a mechanism to disseminate copies of the Title I regulations, program proposals, program evaluations, and information about program learning strategies. The councils, whose membership consisted of parents of Title I students, teachers (Title I and classroom) and community members, also provided a means for parents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to make comments and suggestions about the Title I program. More information about parent advisory council participation may be found in the Report of Evaluation for the Title I Parent Involvement Component.

Parents were also involved by the Title I staff through personal contacts. The program teachers visited homes, wrote letters and made telephone calls so that parents were aware of the Title I program and learned of their children's performance in the program.

II. BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

Figure I lists the budgeted and expended amounts for the Title I Mathematics project for the fiscal year 1982. The figures are summarized from data provided by the Title I Office (see Appendix A).

Figure I

Title I Mathematics Project
Budget and Expenditures

	Budget	Expenditures
Professional Salaries	$632,567.60	$625,342.02
Classified Salaries	9,755.54	9,042,54
Fixed Charges	120,687.46	120,687.46
Materials and Supplies	5,509.00	5,359.38
Professional Services	2,361.00	2,154.62
Telephone	772.80	655.60
Mileage	873.10	807.34
Indirect Costs	25,045.66	25,045.66
Administration	35,321.32	33,122.44
Evaluation	19,559.12	19,559.12
Parent Involvement	21,254.88	19,041.72
Total	$873,707.48	$860,817.90

It should be noted that the budget figures for the secondary Title I program submitted by the Title I Office included data for both reading and math programs. It was reported by that office that the data provided by the Controller's Office was available in this format. In an attempt to gain insight into budget and expenditure figures for the math program only (elementary and secondary), the secondary math dollars were computed for each line item as 38 percent of the total for secondary reading and math. While the figures reported using this system would not be totally accurate, it was discovered that the secondary math program comprises 38 percent of the total secondary program based on staff assigned.

Expenditures for the math program were $860,817.90, approximately 98.5 percent of the amount budgeted. Instructional salaries (includes professional salaries, classified salaries and fixed charges) accounted for 87.7 percent of the total expenditure. As 1,261 students were being served (September, 1981, enrollment) cost per pupil for the program was about $682.65.

III. RESULTS OF EVALUATION

The evaluation of the Title I Mathematics program was based on 13 performance and process objectives selected from the official program proposal and monitored by the Department of Evaluation and Research during the 1981-82 school year. Several other process and performance objectives were monitored by the program coordinators rather than the Department of Evaluation and Research and are not included as a part of this evaluation report.

An accountability file was prepared for the project to facilitate the collection and storage of supportive data for each objective. A "suspense" file was used to monitor receipt of the data. The data collection system provided project management with formative evaluation information throughout the school year. Each objective monitored by the Department of Evaluation and Research is quoted below as it appears in the project proposal and is followed immediately by the evaluation for that objective. Comments and recommendations appear at the end of the report.

During the 1981-82 school year, the Department of Evaluation and Research conducted an additional study that addressed several curriculum evaluation questions pertaining to both the Title I and district reading and mathematics curricula. Specifically the following questions were considered:

(1) Is there a defined curriculum for the Title I Reading and Mathematics programs? How is the Title I curriculum related to the district reading and math curriculum?

(2) How do Individual Educational Plans relate to (support) the district curriculum in reading and math? How do Individual Educational Plans support the Title I curriculum? and

(3) What types of input do Title I teachers contribute to planning sessions with classroom teachers? What types of input do classroom teachers contribute to planning sessions with Title I teachers?

Data reported in this study were gathered through interviews with Title I coordinators, district supervisors of reading and mathematics and through on-site visits to Title I buildings.

The results of this study including recommendations were published in a report entitled Curriculum Study, Title I E.S.E.A. Copies of this report dated June 18, 1982, are on file in the Department of Evaluation and Research.

II. Administration

II B 2. By November 27, 1981, the principal of each elementary school served by the project shall monitor the joint activities of the project teachers and classroom teachers. He/she will visit classrooms to assure that Title I students are receiving direct instruction in mathematics from the classroom teacher as well as from the Title I teacher.

Documentation: report of supervision of the Title I program submitted by December 4, 1981, to the Executive Director of Elementary Education (public) or the Superintendent Des Moines Diocese (non-public).

A copy of the Principal's Report of Title I Supervision appears in Appendix B. The form indicates the date and time the building principal observed each classroom teacher that had Title I students in his/her classes. Two areas received special emphasis during the observation. They were: (a) whether direct instruction in math was provided to Title I students by the classroom teacher; and (b) if joint planning between classroom and Title I teachers was occurring. Although several

of the forms were not received until some time after the date specified in the objective, the reports indicated that the observations were carried out in a timely manner and that areas observed contained no discrepancies. This objective was achieved.

III. Students

III A 1. At the end of the instruction year, students (Grades 2-8) enrolled in the mathematics program for a minimum of 80 days will demonstrate an increase in the mean percentile rank from pre to posttest on the mathematics composite score of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

Documentation: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills scores submitted to the Director of Evaluation and Research at the end of the project year.

Table 1 reports of ITBS scores from fall and spring testing on each of the three mathematics subtests -- concepts, problem solving and computation -- as well as the total math score. The scores are reported in Table 1 as percentile ranks. Students in Grades 2 and 3 took the primary battery while students in Grades 4-8 completed the appropriate level of the milti-level battery. Complete pre/post results were available on a total of 956 students. This represents 84 percent of the total number of students in Grades 2-8 enrolled for 80 days or more.

TABLE 1

ITBS/ITED Pre/Post Results (Percentiles)
Mathematics Subtests

		Concepts				Problem Solving				Computation				Total Math			
Grade	Level/Test	N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain
2	7 - ITBS	191	21	28	7	191	24	32	8	191	20	27	7	191	19	28	9
*3	8 - ITBS	157	16	26	10	157	24	28	4	157	17	25	8	157	15	25	10
4	10 - ITBS	160	27	36	9	160	27	32	5	160	20	36	16	160	25	34	9
5	11 - ITBS	172	27	40	13	172	23	29	6	172	27	37	10	172	26	34	8
6	12 - ITBS	125	24	35	11	125	20	22	2	125	24	37	13	125	20	29	9
7	13 - ITBS	105	26	25	-1	105	22	25	3	105	28	38	10	105	23	27	4
8	14 - ITBS	46	18	21	3	46	22	23	1	46	27	33	6	46	20	23	3

*Students at All Saints, St. Anthony, Holy Family #1, Holy Family #2 and Phillips took Level 9 in third grade.

While the individual subtests may be of value in suggesting strengths and weaknesses in certain areas, for purposes of evaluation, the total math score (representing data from all three subtests is probably the most indicative of overall progress. As reflected in Table 1 students at all levels attained an increase in percentile rank in total math.

III A 2. At the end of the instruction year students (Grades 2-8) enrolled in the mathematics program for at least 80 days will demonstrate a proficiency on the mathematics composite score of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills such that the average gain by grade in NCEs will be at least 7.0.

Documentation: Iowa Tests of Basic Skills scores submitted to the Director of Evaluation and Research.

Table 2 reports gains by grade in NCEs (normal curve equivalents) for students with both pre and postscores in math. NCEs for the three subtests as well as for total math are reported although commentary relates entirely to the total math score.

Briefly, the NCE is one of several measurement scales used in testing of student achievement. The advantage of NCEs is that the scale has the same end and midpoints as the percentile rank scale (1, 99, 50) yet has arithmetic properties. This means that the difference between 20 and 24 NCEs has the same meaning as a difference between 10 and 14 NCEs. This property assists the Title I staff in setting goals for determining the amount of achievement that is to occur.

TABLE 2

ITBS/ITED Pre/Post Results (NCEs)
Mathematics Subtests

Grade	Level/Test	Concepts				Problem Solving				Computation				Total Math			
		N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain	N	Pre	Post	Gain
2	7 - ITBS	191	32.7	37.7	5.0	191	35.3	40.2	4.9	191	32.1	37.2	5.1	191	31.7	37.4	5.7
*3	8 - ITBS	157	29.2	36.6	7.4	157	34.8	37.8	3.0	157	30.1	35.9	5.8	157	28.3	35.7	7.4
4	10 - ITBS	160	37.3	42.5	5.2	160	36.9	40.1	3.2	160	32.6	42.5	5.9	160	35.5	41.3	5.8
5	11 - ITBS	172	37.3	44.8	7.5	172	34.5	38.1	3.6	172	37.3	42.9	5.6	172	36.7	41.5	4.8
6	12 - ITBS	125	34.8	42.1	7.3	125	32.4	33.8	1.4	125	35.1	42.9	7.8	125	32.2	38.5	6.3
7	13 - ITBS	105	36.6	35.8	-0.8	105	33.6	35.6	2.0	105	38.0	43.4	5.4	105	34.4	36.8	2.4
8	14 - ITBS	46	31.0	32.8	1.8	46	33.6	34.1	0.5	46	37.2	40.8	3.6	46	32.0	34.4	2.4

*Students at All Saints, St. Anthony, Holy Family #1, Holy Family #2 and Phillips took Level 9 in third grade.

As with the percentle results in Table 1, gains in NCEs occurred at all grade levels. These gains were not, however, large enough to achieve the criteria specified in the objective except at Grade 3.

As 1981-82 was the first year that the ITBS/ITED was used as a student performance evaluation instrument, it is recommended that program staff utilize the test data as a baseline for setting performance levels for 1982-83. In doing so, the program staff may wish to consider establishing gain criteria specific to each grade level rather than applicable across all grades.

III A 3. At the end of the instruction year, at least 70 percent of the first grade students enrolled in the mathematics program at least 80 days will achieve a score of 26 or above on the Mathematics Test for Performance Objectives.

Documentation: Mathematics Test for Performance Objectives scores submitted to the Director of Evaluation and Research.

A total of 125 first grade Title I students at 16 buildings who were enrolled for 80 days or more completed the first grade Mathematics Test for Performance Objectives during May, 1982. This objective was not

achieved as 65.6 percent scored 26 or above. It should be noted, however, that the average number of correct items was 27.6.

III A 4. Students (Grades 1-8) enrolled in the program a minimum of 80 days will exhibit knowledge of mathematics concepts and computation by mastering 80 percent of the objectives presented to them.

Documentation: a completed Student Record Folder for each student served on file in each building and the Semester Summary Report submitted to the project coordinators at the end of each semester.

Table 3 indicates level of mastery of objectives introduced to Title I Math students by grade. Students at all grades with the exception of 6 and 7 mastered 80 percent or more of the objectives presented to them. Overall, the 1,250 students for whom data was received mastered 81.6 percent of the objectives introduced. This objective was achieved.

TABLE 3

Mathematics Objectives Introduced and Achieved

Grade	N	Average Number of Objectives Per Pupil	Percent Attained
1	137	31	81.6
2	227	39	84.3
3	192	40	86.1
4	179	42	81.3
5	189	46	80.9
6	145	43	79.7
7	125	45	75.0
8	56	47	80.6
1-8	1250	41	81.6

III A 5. By the end of the project year, public school students (Grades 7-8) enrolled in the program for a minimum of 80 days will display a more positive attitude toward learning than they displayed at the time of their entrance into the program.

Documentation: pre and postattitude toward learning inventory submitted to the Director of Evaluation and Research at the end of the project year.

Table 4 shows results from administration of the Self-Anchoring Attitude Toward Learning Scale. This inventory, designed to assess attitudes toward learning of individuals in Grade 5 through adult, was developed by staff at the Heartland Area Education Agency. A copy of this instrument appears in Appendix C.

Only students who completed the scale at both administrations (fall/spring) were included in the data. As shown in the table, the students at each building demonstrated gains in mean score on a pre/post basis. The programwide gain for a total of 126 students was .79. This objective was achieved.

TABLE 4

Attitude Toward Learning
Survey Results

School	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Gain
Callanan	36	5.92	7.25	1.33
Harding	51	6.86	7.02	0.16
Hiatt	18	6.28	7.08	0.80
Weeks	21	5.50	6.86	1.36
All Schools	126	6.28	7.07	0.79

III A 6. During the project year, public school students (Grades 7-8) enrolled in the program for a minimum of 80 days will respond positively to the program as indicated by their rate of attendance being equal to or greater than that of all non Title I students in the same schools.

Documentation: Semester Summary Report submitted with the May accountability data to the Secondary Coordinator and Director of Evaluation and Research.

Table 5 shows attendance rates for Title I students as well as for students not enrolled in Title I but attending Title I buildings. Data for students who were enrolled less than 80 days (in either Title I or at the building as non Title I students) were not included. Title I attendance was reported on the Semester Summary form completed by each teacher. School attendance was derived from a computer printout that contained information on attendance reported by each building.

As shown in the table, Title I students demonstrated a lower attendance rate than that for non Title I students at all but one building. At this site, the rate was the same. While caution must be used in interpreting this comparison due to the large difference in the number of students in each group, it is recommended that continued emphasis be placed upon strategies to improve daily attendance of secondary students.

TABLE 5

Secondary School Attendance Results

School	N	Title I Students Attendance Percent	N	All Students Attendance Percent
Callanan	37	93.4	474	93.4
Harding	67	87.4	525	89.6
Hiatt	38	87.3	564	90.3
Weeks	31	87.3	527	90.7
Total	173	88.9	2090	91.0

III A 7. At the end of the project year, 80 percent of public school students (Grades 7-8) enrolled in the program a minimum of 80 days will have written with the staff and attained at least one goal related to math assignments and/or behavioral changes.

Documentation: list of students with the number and kinds of goals attained, submitted to the secondary coordinator and Director of Evaluation and Research at the end of the project year.

A memo written by the Coordinator, Title I Secondary Reading and Math, and received by the Department of Evaluation and Research on June 4, 1982, indicating that all secondary reading and math students worked on goal attainment during the 1981-82 school year. It was reported that most students worked toward the goal of improving their ITBS scores between pre and posttesting. Due to the nonavailability of test results prior to the close of the school year, it was not possible to assess the level of attainment achieved relating to this goal. Students also reportedly set goals related to attendance, grade improvements in math and in-school types of behavior. The coordinator reported that the goal setting process has and continued to be "a motivator as well as a positive self-concept enhancer for students as well as teachers."

IV. Teacher

IV B 1. The project teacher(s) in each building served by the program will identify eligible student participants by September 11, 1981.

Documentation: class lists of identified students and the needs assessment checklist submitted to the project coordinator with the September accountability data.

Title I Math teachers identified eligible participants during the month of September, 1981, as evidenced by class lists indicating the name of each student and other pertinent information. As changes in enrollment occurred teachers submitted a form entitled Revisions of Student List. Table 6 indicates the number of students served by building and grade as identified in September of 1981. This objective was achieved.

TABLE 6

Number of Students Served
Title I Mathematics

School	Grade Level 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
All Saints	-	5	-	-	4	1	-	-	10
Brooks	10	9	17	7	10	7	-	-	60
Edmunds	-	-	-	20	20	19	-	-	59
Findley	3	10	10	6	5	6	-	-	40
Garton	-	12	15	8	27	14	-	-	76
Holy Family #1	2	6	3	5	4	-	-	-	20
Holy Family #2	5	4	10	7	10	-	-	-	36
Holy Family #3	-	-	-	-	-	11	6	7	24
Howe	10	8	6	6	10	-	-	-	40
Jefferson	10	35	15	-	-	-	-	-	60
King	20	20	20	-	-	-	-	-	60
Longfellow	5	5	12	7	9	2	-	-	40
Lucas	3	13	9	3	8	4	-	-	40
Madison	4	7	3	4	-	-	-	-	18
McKinley	6	3	6	5	-	-	-	-	20
Mitchell	12	13	8	11	10	4	-	-	58
Monroe	-	-	-	14	13	12	-	-	39
Moulton	-	21	10	21	19	14	-	-	85
Oak Park	3	7	7	2	-	-	-	-	19
Perkins	-	-	-	18	22	20	-	-	60
Phillips	5	9	10	10	3	3	-	-	40
Rice	6	19	15	-	-	-	-	-	40
St. Anthony	6	6	2	2	1	1	-	-	18
Wallace	10	10	14	9	11	6	-	-	60
Willard	3	14	7	17	10	9	-	-	60
Callanan	-	-	-	-	-	-	21	19	40
Harding	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	20	64
Hiatt	-	-	-	-	-	-	28	11	39
Weeks	-	-	-	-	-	8	26	2	36
All Schools	123	236	199	182	196	141	125	59	1261

IV B 4. By the end of the first semester, project teachers will have personal contact with parents of at least 80 percent of the total number of students (Grades 1-6) enrolled in the program for a minimum of 20 days. The parents of 65 percent of students new to the program will be visited in their homes or at a place selected by the parent(s).

Documentation: parent contact report on the semester summary submitted to the appropriate project coordinator, the building principal, and the Department of Evaluation and Research with the January accountability data.

IV B 5. By the end of the first semester, project teachers will have personal contact with parents at home or a place selected by the parent(s) of at least 65 percent of the total number of students (Grades 7-8) enrolled in the program for a minimum of 20 days.

Documentation: parent contact report on the semester summary submitted to the appropriate project coordinator, the building principal, and the Department of Evaluation and Research with the January accountability data.

IV B 6. By the end of the second semester each project teacher will have had personal conferences (at home, school, or by telephone) with the parent(s) of at least 80 percent of the total number (Grades 1-8) of students whom he/she has served during the second semester.

Documentation: parent contact report on the semester summary report submitted to the appropriate project coordinator, the building principal, and the Department of Evaluation and Research with the May accountability data.

Table 7 shows information related to parent contacts for elementary and secondary math students during the first and second semester. Three program objectives specify criteria for parent contacts.

In Grades 1-6, 82.5 percent of the parents were contacted personally by the Title I teacher during the first semester. This may have included a conference, visit by the parent to the classroom or home visit made by the Title I teacher. The number of contacts made surpassed the criteria specified. This objective also states that home visits or contacts at

school were to be made to parents of 65 percent of students new to the program. As the table indicates, 82.7 percent of the parents of new students were visited at home or came to school for a conference or visit. This means that Objective IV B 4 dealing with parent contacts at the elementary level during the first semester was totally achieved.

Objective IV B 5 dealing with secondary parent contacts during the first semester requires that 65 percent of the parents of project students be contacted at home or school. As indicated in the table, 53 percent of the parents were contacted in this manner. This objective was not achieved.

Finally, Objective IV B 6 indicates criteria for parent contacts at all levels during the second semester. The objective states that parents of 80 percent of the students will be contacted at home, school or by telephone. As shown by the table, 82.1 percent of the parents were contacted in this manner. This objective was achieved.

The data presented in Table 7 indicates achievement of all parent contact objectives with the exception of the one dealing with secondary students during the first semester.

TABLE 7

Parent Contacts by Semester

1st Semester					2nd Semester		
Grade	Number of Students	Percent of Personal Contacts	Number of New Students	Percent of Home Visits/ Personal Contacts	Grade	Number of Students	Percent of Personal Contacts
1-6	1155	82.5	952	82.7	1-6	1128	83.9
7-8	190	53.2	NOT APPLICABLE		7-8	194	72.2
Total						1322	82.1

KEY:
1st semester personal contacts - personal contacts made at home or school.
2nd semester personal contacts - contacts made at home, school or by telephone.

VII. Parents

VII A 1. Near the end of the project year parents of identified Title I students will respond positively to the project activities.

Documentation: a summary of responses obtained by the project coordinator on the parent opinionnaire.

Results of the Title I parent opinionnaire are reported in the 1981-82 Report of Evaluation for the Title I Parent Involvement Component under Objective VII A 1. A copy of the opinionnaire appears in Appendix D of that report.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IV. COMMENTS

Title I Mathematics students mastered in excess of 80 percent of the objectives presented to them.

According to results of the Self-Anchoring Attitude Toward Learning Scale, students in Grades 7 and 8 displayed a more positive attitude toward learning near the close of the school year than in the fall.

Personal contacts between Title I teachers and parents of students they serve occurred with the frequency necessary to achieve all objectives with the exception of the one dealing with secondary program students during the first semester.

Attendance records indicated that secondary Title I students attended school 88.9 percent of the days possible while non Title I students at the same buildings attended 91.0 percent. At one building, the same rate of attendance was exhibited.

The process of setting goals for students to work toward in the secondary program was reported as being a "motivator as well as a positive self-concept enhancer for students and teachers."

Students at all grade levels achieved an increase in percentile rank from fall to spring testing in total math on the appropriate level of the ITBS.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Program administration should continue implementation of strategies to encourage improved school attendance of Title I students at the secondary level.
2. The process of student goal setting appears to be a positive strategy in the secondary program and should be continued.
3. The secondary program should continue to work toward increasing the number of parent contacts so criterion levels may be met.
4. As 1981-82 was the first year that the ITBS was used in this program as a student performance evaluation instrument, it is recommended that program staff utilize the test data as a baseline for setting performance criterion levels for 1982-83. In doing so, the program staff may wish to consider establishing gain criteria specific to each grade level rather than having a single gain criteria apply to all grades.

APPENDIX A

Budget and Expenditures

BUDGET EXPENDITURES
ELEMENTARY MATH
1981-82

		Budgeted		Expended	
Professional Salaries					
1 Coordinator		28,659		28,028	
27 Teachers		482,034		474,588	
Substitutes		4,980		6,530	
	Total		515,653		509,146
Classified Salaries					
1 Secretary		8,109		7,396	
	Total		8,109		7,396
Fixed Charges					
		99,515		99,515	
	Total		99,515		99,515
Materials & Supplies					
		3,780		3,725	
	Total		3,780		3,725
Professional Services					
Inservice					
Travel					
	Total		1,050		939
Telephone					
	Total		560		477
Mileage					
	Total		495		487
Indirect cost					
	Total		20,823		20,825
Administration					
Professional salaries					
Fixed charges					
Audit					
Travel & mileage					
Supplies and materials					
Computer costs					
	Total		29,369		27,541
Evaluation					
Professional salaries					
Fixed charges					
Travel					
Materials & supplies					
Data Processing					
	Total		16,263		16,263

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Secondary Reading and Math
1981-82

	Budgeted	Expended
Professional Salaries		
1 Coordinator	23,474	23,474
13.5 Teachers	281,421	279,820
Substitutes	2,775	2,485
Classified Salaries		
.5 Secretaries	4,333	4,333
Fixed Charges	55,717	55,717
Materials & Supplies		
Supplies	4,550	4,301
Professional Services		
Inservice Travel Conference	3,450	3,199
Telephone	560	470
Mileage	995	843
Indirect Charges	11,107	11,107
Administration		
Professional Salaries Classified Salaries Fixed Charges Auditing Travel & Mileage Supplies & Materials Computer Costs	15,664	14,688
Evaluation		
Professional Salaries Fixed Charges Travel Materials & Supplies Data Processing	8,674	8,674
Parent Involvement		
Professional Salaries Fixed Charges Dissemination Telephone SPAC & DPAC materials, supplies & travel	9,426	8,444
	422,146.00	417,555.00

APPENDIX B

Principal's Report of Title I Supervision

PRINCIPAL'S REPORT OF TITLE I SUPERVISION

On Coordination of Classroom Teachers' and Title I Teacher's Instruction

School _____

Date _____

Classroom Teacher	OBSERVATION		Direct Instruction to Title I Students		JOINT PLANNING		COMMENTS:
	Date	Time	Yes	No	Yes	No	

Due: by December 4

Public Schools: 1 copy to Executive Director of Elementary Education, 1 copy file

Parochial Schools: 1 copy Sister Delores McHugh, 1 copy Department of Evaluation, 1 copy file.

_____

Principal's Signature

APPENDIX C

Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF SAAS: SELF-ANCHORING ATTITUDE SCALE (TOWARD LEARNING)

INTRODUCTION

The Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale (Toward Learning) is an inventory designed to assess attitudes toward learning of individuals in Grade 5 through adult. SAAS is unique in that each individual is asked to describe the end-points of the dimension under examination -- in this case attitude toward learning. This self-defined continuum is then used as a measuring device with no further verbal cues.

DIRECTIONS

Check that all students have a pencil or a pen and one blank sheet of paper. To get off to a good start, it is suggested to say something like this.

> *"Today I am going to ask you about students who like to learn and students who dislike to learn. I am interested in your ideas. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers.*
>
> *Not all students are the same. You may feel that some enjoy learning more than others. You may know students who like to learn and students who do not like to learn. Without saying anything to each other, spend the next 3-5 minutes thinking of what you would say about students who like to learn. To help you remember your ideas, write them down on the sheet of paper in front of you."*

Allow 3-5 minutes for the students to complete this. When you are satisfied that they are finished, ask them to spend the next few minutes thinking of what they would say about students who dislike to learn. They can use the other side of the paper to jot down their ideas.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When they are finished, distribute the SAAS form to each student with the "ladder" side showing. Ask them to write their ideas for "Students Who Like to Learn" at the top of the page in the space provided and their ideas for "Students Who Dislike to Learn" at the bottom of the page.

After all students have finished writing, say to the students:

"At the left side of your paper is a picture of a ladder Your description of students who like to learn is located at the top of the ladder and your description of students who dislike to learn is at the bottom.

You may be at the top of the ladder -- that is, a student who likes to learn. Or you may be at the very bottom of the ladder -- a student who dislikes to learn. Quite possibly you are somewhere in between those who like to learn and those who dislike to learn.

Take your pencil and mark an "X" on the rung of the ladder where you think you are right now."

When you are satisfied that all students have finished, ask them to write in their name, school, grade, and the day's date in the space provided above the ladder. Also, have them write in their name in the top right hand corner of the form in the space provided.

Collect all the SAAS forms.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE POST-TEST ADMINISTRATION OF
SAAS: SELF-ANCHORING ATTITUDE SCALE (TOWARD LEARNING)

INFORMATION ABOUT SAAS

The Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale (Toward Learning) is an inventory designed to assess attitudes toward learning of individuals in Grade 5 through adult. SAAS is unique in that each individual is asked to describe the end-points of the dimension under examination -- in this case attitude toward learning. This self-defined continuum is then used as a measuring device with no further verbal cues.

DIRECTIONS

Check that all students have a pencil. Return the green SAAS form to the student who is identified on the form. The student's "fall rating" (the ladder having the student's first rating) should not be returned.

After all students have their original copy of the green SAAS form, say to the students:

> *"Last fall you described students who liked to learn and wrote that at the top of the page. You, also, described students who disliked to learn and you wrote that at the bottom of the page.*
>
> *Read these descriptions. You may be like the student at the top of the page -- you may be like the student at the bottom of the page -- or you may be somewhere in between those who like to learn and those who dislike to learn.*
>
> *Take your pencil and mark a X on the rung of the ladder where you think you are right now.*
>
> *If you would like to write more about students who like to learn or students who dislike to learn, please do so. Write those comments and today's date beside any comments you add.*

When you are satisfied that all students have finished, ask them to write their name, school, grade and the day's date in the space provided above the ladder.

Collect all the SAAS forms.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

GRADE _____

DATE _____

STUDENTS WHO LIKE TO LEARN

STUDENTS WHO DISLIKE TO LEARN